

## REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are in the case and stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 over USAN 2001/0021019 to Nara et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER §103

Independent claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, a method for analyzing defect information on a substrate by (1) logically dividing the substrate into zones, (2) detecting defects on the substrate to produce the defect information, (3) analyzing the defect information from the substrate on a zone by zone basis to produce defect level classifications for the defects within each zone, and (4) analyzing the zonal defect level classifications according to at least one analysis method.

Applicants assert that the examiner has not made out a *prima facia* case of obviousness. The only specific reference to the teachings of Naya et al. is to paragraph [0003], which is cited to only support the notion that “the substrate being inspected has thereon a plurality of circuit patterns.” None of the locations of the other asserted teachings of Naya et al. are referenced in the document.

Applicants assert that Naya et al. does not contain the teachings as asserted by the examiner, but invite the examiner to provide specific reference to those teachings, if they do in fact exist. In the absence of such specific references, applicants traverse the assertions of the examiner as to the teachings of Naya et al.

For example, Naya et al. do not appear to teach step (3) above, which is the step of *analyzing* the defect information from the substrate *on a zone by zone basis* to produce defect level classifications for the defects *within each zone*. Naya et al. do not appear to teach (a) the analysis of defect information on a zone by zone basis, or (b) the production of defect level classifications within each zone.

Thus, claim 1 patentably defines over Nara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of claim 1 are respectfully requested. Dependent claims 2-5 depend from independent claim 1, and contain additional important aspects of the invention. Therefore, dependent

claims 2-5 patentably define over Nara et al. Reconsideration and allowance of dependent claims 2-5 are respectfully requested.

Applicants further assert that the elements of the dependent claims have not been adequately considered or found in the reference by the examiner. For example, claim 5 recites that the defect information is logically divided into configurable zones *after* the defects on the substrate have been detected. Naya et al. does not appear to teach the logical division of defect information into zones *after* the detection of the defects. The examiner is again invited to more specifically indicate those portions of Naya et al. wherein he believes these teaches to be recited.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants assert that the claims of the present application patentably define over the prior art made of record and not relied upon for the same reasons as given above. Applicants respectfully submit that a full and complete response to the office action is provided herein, and that the application is now fully in condition for allowance. Action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

In the event this response is not timely filed, applicants hereby petition for the appropriate extension of time. If any fees are required by this response, such fees may be charged to deposit account 12-2355.

Sincerely,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: 

Rick Barnes, 39,596

---

2007.07.26